

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 remain pending in the current Application. Claim 1 has been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter to the current Application. All the amendments herein have been made in order to clarify the claims and not for prior art reasons. Applicants also submit that (1) no amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein, and (2) no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Rejection of claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. 101

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-30 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 101. With respect to claim 1, the Examiner indicates that the claim is not a practical application of an abstract idea which would produce a “useful, concrete or tangible results,” and specifically states that “the final result i.e., ‘selectively accepting’ is still considered a determination, a conditional thought, or a computation.” Although Applicants respectfully disagree because claim 1, as a whole, accomplishes a practical application in that a message is accepted or not, Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that the method occurs within a packet controller (which may be used, for example, within a communication system), and that the method further includes that when the message is accepted, the accepted message is stored. Therefore, this stored accepted message is a useful, concrete and tangible result. For example, it is a tangible and concrete result which allows for a message, which was accepted, to be further processed by, e.g., the packet controller or a communication system. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is not merely directed to an abstract idea, and is patentable under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 2-24 are dependent directly or indirectly off of allowable claim 1 and are therefore also allowable for at least those reasons provided with respect to claim 1.

With respect to claim 25, Applicants submit that claim 25 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. 101. Claim 25 is directed to a packet controller which includes an input, pattern matching logic, and control logic to selectively accept a received message. That is, claim

25 claims a new and useful specific machine (e.g. a packet controller) in terms of its hardware and is therefore patentable under 35 U.S.C. 101. That is, the packet controller of claim 25 is not simply a law of nature, a natural phenomena, nor an abstract idea.

Conclusion

The Office Action contains numerous statements characterizing the claims, the Specification, and the prior art. Regardless of whether such statements are addressed by Applicants, Applicants refuse to subscribe to any of these statements, unless expressly indicated by Applicants.

Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the pending claims. Should there be any issues or questions regarding this communication or the current Application, please feel free to contact me.

If Applicant has overlooked any additional fees, or if any overpayment has been made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit or debit Deposit Account 503079, Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By: _____



Joanna G. Chiu

Attorney of Record

Reg. No.: 43,629

Telephone: (512) 996-6839

Fax No.: (512) 996-6854